



ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL SANCTIONS AS EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTING SEXUAL VIOLENCE BY FACULTY MEMBERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Suardi¹, Herdianty Ramlan², Shahrin Bin Hashim³, Nursalam⁴, Rahmat Nur⁵, Hasruddin Nur⁶

^{1,2,4} Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

³Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

⁵Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

⁶Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding author e-mail: suardi@unismuh.ac.id

ABSTRACT. This study investigates the effectiveness of academic and social sanctions as preventive measures against sexual violence perpetrated by faculty members in higher education institutions. Despite increasing institutional efforts, sexual violence persists as a serious threat to student safety and institutional credibility. The study aims to assess perceptions of sanction effectiveness, enforcement challenges, and stakeholder expectations to inform comprehensive prevention strategies. A mixed-methods design was applied, integrating quantitative surveys of students, faculty, and university leaders with qualitative interviews and focus group discussions. Quantitative data measured levels of agreement with different sanctions, while qualitative insights explored institutional practices and cultural factors shaping implementation. The findings demonstrate strong support for strict academic sanctions—such as dismissal, suspension, and demotion—and complementary social sanctions, including exclusion from academic activities and revocation of supervisory privileges. These measures were perceived as essential deterrents, reinforcing both formal accountability and social reputation. Qualitative evidence emphasized the importance of transparent enforcement, survivor-centered reporting mechanisms, and institutional commitment to overcoming barriers related to power imbalances and underreporting. This research provides empirical evidence for the value of an integrated sanction framework. It highlights the need to combine academic and social sanctions with educational and supportive interventions to ensure sustainable prevention. The findings offer actionable guidance for policymakers and higher education institutions seeking to strengthen accountability and reduce faculty-perpetrated sexual violence.

Keywords: Academic sanctions; Social sanctions; Sexual violence prevention

INTRODUCTION

Sexual violence in higher education institutions remains a critical global concern, profoundly affecting student safety, well-being, and academic performance. Despite growing awareness and institutional efforts, faculty-perpetrated sexual misconduct continues to challenge universities worldwide (Rahmasari et al., 2023; Rieger et al., 2023). Such violations call for a comprehensive prevention framework that extends beyond legal and administrative measures to include cultural, social, and educational dimensions (V. Banyard, Edwards,

Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022). Research has consistently shown that sexual violence undermines the physical and psychological health of survivors and erodes trust in academic environments, ultimately damaging institutional credibility and learning outcomes (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Grimm et al., 2021). Therefore, identifying effective strategies to prevent faculty-perpetrated sexual violence is essential for fostering safe, equitable, and inclusive university communities.

Recent studies have emphasized the complexity and multifaceted nature of sexual violence

prevention in academic settings, underscoring the need for multidimensional interventions (Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, & Raj, 2022; Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, Yore, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022). Common approaches often involve bystander education, empowerment training, and policy reforms designed to disrupt enabling conditions and promote proactive community engagement (V. L. Banyard et al., 2020; Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022). However, a significant gap remains in understanding the specific role of institutional sanctions—both academic and social—in influencing perpetrator behavior and reinforcing normative standards within academic hierarchies (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Sanctions are particularly important given the power asymmetries in faculty-student relationships, which often complicate reporting, accountability, and justice (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Graham, Potterton, et al., 2021; Graham, Treharne, et al., 2021). Thus, an integrated approach combining sanction mechanisms with cultural and educational reforms is vital for sustained prevention.

Addressing sexual violence perpetrated by faculty requires balancing disciplinary action with an institutional climate that encourages reporting and protects victims (V. Banyard, A. Waterman, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Waterman, et al., 2022; Imania & Santoso, 2023). Traditional punitive measures—such as suspension, demotion, or dismissal—act as deterrents by threatening the professional status and livelihood of perpetrators (Rahmasari et al., 2023; Rieger et al., 2023). However, empirical evidence suggests that their effectiveness is contingent upon consistent enforcement, transparency, and alignment with restorative practices (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022). In addition, social sanctions—including reputational harm, community exclusion, and loss of professional privileges—serve as powerful complements that enhance the deterrent effect of formal disciplinary action (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). Together, these dual sanction systems provide a more comprehensive form of deterrence by addressing both external consequences and internal ethical considerations (Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, & Raj, 2022; Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, Yore, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

Conventional prevention strategies in higher education have primarily focused on awareness campaigns, policy implementation, and legal compliance (V. L. Banyard et al., 2020; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). Many institutions

mandate sexual misconduct training, develop confidential reporting systems, and enforce zero-tolerance policies to mitigate risks (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Imania & Santoso, 2023). Nevertheless, challenges such as underreporting, institutional protectionism, and cultural stigma continue to hinder the effectiveness of these efforts (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). Emerging approaches emphasize community involvement and empowerment-based models that promote shared responsibility and cultural change conducive to sustained behavioral transformation (V. L. Banyard et al., 2020; Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022). Yet, the specific impact and mechanisms of academic and social sanctions as direct deterrents against faculty perpetrators remain underexplored (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

The literature suggests targeted solutions to address this gap, including a formal sanction framework integrated with institutional policy reforms and survivor-centered practices (Rieger et al., 2023; Banyard et al., 2022). Establishing clear and enforceable disciplinary guidelines that articulate consequences for faculty misconduct enhances both accountability and prevention (Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Embedding social sanctions within institutional culture—through public disclosure, loss of academic privileges, and community censure—reinforces behavioral boundaries and social norms against misconduct (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). When combined with supportive reporting systems and educational programs, these sanctions create a synergistic effect that strengthens prevention outcomes (V. Banyard, A. Waterman, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Waterman, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Waterman, et al., 2022).

Empirical research further underscores the importance of transparent and consistent sanction enforcement in fostering institutional trust and empowering both victims and observers (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rieger et al., 2023). Without reliable accountability, sanctions risk being perceived as symbolic or selective, thereby weakening their deterrent impact (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Moreover, social sanctions exert psychological pressure by stigmatizing and socially excluding perpetrators, deterring potential offenders who are motivated by social identity and professional reputation (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). These insights support the integration of formal and informal sanctions within a

comprehensive framework addressing prevention, response, and cultural transformation (V. Banyard, A. Waterman, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Waterman, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Waterman, et al., 2022).

Despite progress, important gaps remain in understanding how academic and social sanctions influence attitudes, behaviors, and institutional culture over time (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023). The interplay between formal disciplinary procedures and informal social consequences, along with potential unintended effects such as underreporting or retaliation, remains insufficiently explored (Casey et al., 2021; Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022). Addressing these challenges is crucial to optimizing sanction strategies and aligning them with broader goals of empowerment, equity, and trauma-informed care (Milroy et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

This study aims to investigate the roles and effects of academic and social sanctions as preventive mechanisms against faculty-perpetrated sexual violence in higher education. It explores perceptions, effectiveness, and enforcement challenges from the perspectives of key stakeholders, including survivors, faculty, and policymakers. By integrating qualitative and quantitative data, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of sanctions within university settings (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Its scope includes policy analysis, sanction outcomes, and cultural factors influencing prevention, thereby addressing critical knowledge gaps.

The guiding research question is: How do academic and social sanctions influence the prevention of sexual violence against students in higher education? The answers aim to inform evidence-based policies and practices to strengthen institutional accountability and enhance prevention in academic environments.

Literature Review

Sexual violence in higher education continues to pose a significant threat to student safety, well-being, and academic success globally. Recent scholarship emphasizes the complex and multifaceted nature of prevention efforts, calling for comprehensive frameworks that address legal, institutional, cultural, and social dimensions (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Faculty-perpetrated sexual misconduct presents unique challenges due to entrenched power imbalances and the complex reporting dynamics inherent in academic hierarchies (Casey & Hampson, 2022;

Graham, Potterton, et al., 2021; Graham, Treharne, et al., 2021). These challenges contribute to underreporting and hinder institutional accountability, highlighting the need for targeted interventions that combine formal sanctions with cultural and educational reforms (V. Banyard, A. Waterman, et al., 2022; V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Nengyanti et al., 2024).

Institutional sanctions—particularly academic disciplinary actions—are widely recognized as critical tools for preventing sexual violence and signaling organizational intolerance toward misconduct. Research shows that measures such as suspension, demotion, and dismissal not only penalize perpetrators but also establish normative expectations that regulate faculty behavior (Rahmasari et al., 2023; Rieger et al., 2023). (Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022) and (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022) stress the importance of enforceable sanctions embedded within transparent, survivor-centered procedures to maximize prevention and encourage reporting. Nevertheless, empirical evidence warns that inconsistent enforcement and institutional protectionism may undermine sanction effectiveness, resulting in symbolic punishment that fails to deter future violations (Casey et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022).

Beyond formal academic sanctions, social sanctions have gained attention as powerful complementary deterrents. These include reputational damage, social exclusion, and the loss of professional privileges, which operate through peer and community pressure to reinforce institutional norms against sexual misconduct (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). The literature highlights the psychological effects of social sanctions on perpetrators, threatening their social identity and professional legitimacy, and thereby supplementing extrinsic punishment with intrinsic motivation for behavioral change (Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, & Raj, 2022; Kaufman, Lee, Milroy, Yore, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). (Casey & Hampson, 2022) further argue that embedding social sanctions within academic culture cultivates an environment of zero tolerance for abuse and promotes normative shifts critical for sustained prevention.

However, the use of sanctions as a preventive strategy is complicated by institutional power dynamics and cultural factors. Faculty status, organizational hierarchies, and mental health considerations may enable some perpetrators to evade accountability or continue offending despite sanctions, as evidenced in qualitative studies (Graham, Potterton, et al., 2021; Graham, Treharne,

et al., 2021; Imania & Santoso, 2023). These structural barriers demand an integrated approach that aligns sanctions with trauma-informed care, educational initiatives, and community engagement to address root causes and promote ethical awareness (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022). The socio-ecological model supports multi-level interventions that combine individual, relational, community, and institutional strategies to produce meaningful change (Rieger et al., 2023).

Prevention programs that incorporate bystander education, empowerment training, and policy reform have demonstrated potential in mobilizing community action and disrupting enabling conditions (V. L. Banyard et al., 2020; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). However, the literature reveals critical gaps concerning the specific role and mechanisms of academic and social sanctions targeting perpetrators. These include insufficient understanding of how sanctions influence faculty attitudes, the cultural factors affecting their acceptance, and unintended consequences such as underreporting or retaliation (Casey et al., 2021; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Addressing these gaps is essential for optimizing sanction frameworks and aligning them with broader institutional goals such as empowerment, equity, and trauma-informed prevention (Edwards, Siller, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022).

Recent empirical studies advocate for clear, enforceable disciplinary policies that delineate explicit consequences for faculty misconduct to enhance accountability and prevention (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Rieger et al., 2023). Embedding social sanctions into institutional culture—through transparency, public disclosure, and collective condemnation—strengthens behavioral boundaries and promotes shared responsibility (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). Integrating formal and informal sanctions with robust reporting systems and educational programs yields synergistic effects that bolster prevention outcomes and institutional trust (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Imania & Santoso, 2023).

Trust in institutional processes and perceptions of justice in sanction enforcement significantly influence victims' willingness to report and bystanders' readiness to intervene (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Transparent and consistent enforcement enhances legitimacy and counters skepticism regarding selective or symbolic punishment (Edwards,

Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). Moreover, psychological research suggests that the stigmatizing effects of social sanctions contribute to prevention by diminishing perpetrators' social capital and signaling collective disapproval (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022).

The integration of academic and social sanctions within a comprehensive institutional framework aligns with best practices in prevention that balance punitive, restorative, and educational elements (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). Such a framework addresses not only individual behavior but also the systemic cultural factors that sustain sexual violence (Rahmasari et al., 2023). Mixed-methods research supports a pluralistic approach capable of capturing the complexity of sanction implementation and stakeholder responses (Nur & Nur, 2024; Rieger et al., 2023).

In sum, the scholarly discourse underscores the need for multidimensional prevention strategies that integrate enforceable academic sanctions with culturally embedded social sanctions, supplemented by educational and supportive interventions. This comprehensive approach is essential for transforming institutional culture, enhancing accountability, and reducing faculty-perpetrated sexual violence in higher education settings (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

METHOD

This study adopted a mixed-methods approach to comprehensively examine the role of academic and social sanctions in preventing sexual violence perpetrated by faculty members against students in higher education institutions. Mixed-methods research has gained recognition for its capacity to generate nuanced understandings of complex social phenomena by integrating numerical data with contextualized institutional practices and lived experiences (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Nur & Nur, 2024; Suardi, 2025; Suardi, Hashim, et al., 2024, 2023; Suardi, Nursalam, et al., 2023, 2024). This approach aligns with current methodological pluralism, particularly in addressing multifaceted issues such as sexual violence prevention, which require both measurable outcomes and subjective perspectives (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022).

The quantitative component involved collecting and analyzing survey data from students, faculty, and university leaders to assess perceptions of sanction

effectiveness, incident prevalence, and attitudes toward institutional policies. Structured questionnaires were developed based on validated instruments from prior sexual violence prevention studies to ensure construct reliability and validity (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). The survey included Likert-scale items measuring perceived fairness of sanctions, trust in enforcement mechanisms, and willingness to report violations. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to identify correlations and significant differences among stakeholder groups (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Suardi, 2025; Suardi, Nursalam, et al., 2024).

The qualitative phase employed semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions to obtain deeper insights into participants' experiences, attitudes, and challenges related to the implementation of sanctions and the culture of sexual violence prevention within universities. This qualitative inquiry enabled the exploration of nuanced themes regarding power dynamics, institutional barriers, and the social consequences of sanction practices (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Imania & Santoso, 2023). Participants were purposefully sampled to include survivors, faculty members across roles, and policymakers, ensuring a diversity of perspectives and thematic saturation (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Rieger et al., 2023). Interview and discussion transcripts were analyzed thematically, following established qualitative protocols for systematic coding and categorization (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022).

Data integration followed a convergent parallel design, wherein quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed simultaneously, and then merged during interpretation to reinforce and complement findings (Rieger et al., 2023; Suardi, Nursalam, et al., 2024). This design allowed for a holistic understanding of the efficacy and challenges of sanction strategies by combining statistical trends with lived experiences, thereby enhancing the validity and applicability of conclusions (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). The mixed-methods approach also facilitated the identification of discrepancies between official policies and practical realities, informing institutional improvement (Casey & Hampson, 2022; Imania & Santoso, 2023).

Ethical considerations were rigorously observed throughout the study, given the sensitive nature of sexual violence research. Protocols ensured confidentiality, informed consent, and the provision of psychological support, adhering to recommended

ethical standards (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). Anonymity was guaranteed, and participants retained the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained to uphold ethical compliance (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022). The research team employed trauma-informed interview techniques to minimize participant distress and foster respectful and open dialogue (Grimmett et al., 2021; Rieger et al., 2023).

Data collection was conducted across multiple universities to capture institutional diversity and variations in sexual violence prevention policies (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023). This multi-site strategy allowed for comparative analysis of policy design, enforcement consistency, and cultural factors influencing sanction effectiveness. Sampling strategies included stratified random sampling for surveys to ensure representative coverage of academic staff and student demographics, while qualitative participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling to identify individuals with relevant experience or insights (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022).

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical software to conduct descriptive and inferential analyses, including frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and regression modeling to identify predictors of sanction perceptions and reporting behaviors (Suardi, 2025; Suardi, Nursalam, et al., 2024). Qualitative data were coded both inductively and deductively using software-assisted thematic analysis to uncover patterns related to sanction implementation challenges, cultural resistance, and the impact of social sanctions (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). Cross-method triangulation ensured robust validation and comprehensive interpretation, reflecting both objective outcomes and subjective experiences (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022).

This mixed-methods design reflects best practices in contemporary sexual violence prevention research, emphasizing the value of multi-dimensional approaches to capture the complexity of institutional and interpersonal factors involved (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rieger et al., 2023). By combining the breadth of quantitative data with the depth of qualitative insights, this study advances understanding of academic and social sanctions as deterrents and social signals that shape norms and behaviors within higher education (V. Banyard,

Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023). The methodology supports the generation of actionable insights to guide culturally responsive and effective policy and program improvements (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022).

In summary, this study employed a rigorous mixed-methods framework to elucidate the role of sanctions in preventing faculty-perpetrated sexual violence. Through integrated statistical and thematic analysis, alongside ethical rigor and a multi-site design, the research enhances the credibility and generalizability of findings, contributing to evidence-based interventions in academic settings (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The quantitative findings of this study indicate substantial support for a range of academic and social sanctions aimed at preventing sexual violence perpetrated by faculty members against students in higher education. Table 1 summarizes the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' agreement with various academic sanctions, including written warnings, written apologies to victims, temporary demotion, suspension from teaching, permanent dismissal, and termination of employment.

Table 1. Agreement on Academic Sanctions for Faculty Perpetrators of Sexual Violence (N=419)

Academic Sanction	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Written warning as initial reprimand	38.43	29.36	4.54	3.34	0.95
Written apology to victim	40.33	26.25	5.49	3.82	0.72
Functional demotion for a period	38.66	30.55	5.73	1.19	0.48
Suspension from teaching and supervision	40.10	31.03	4.77	0.72	—
Permanent dismissal from institution	43.20	26.01	7.16	0.24	—
Termination of employment	37.71	30.79	7.88	0.24	—

Note: Table presents the distribution of respondent agreement with academic sanctions as preventive measures for faculty sexual misconduct.

The majority of respondents—over two-thirds—strongly agreed or agreed with the application of strict academic sanctions as effective deterrents. Permanent dismissal received the highest level of

strong agreement (43.20%), highlighting a public demand for decisive consequences to uphold safety and justice in academic environments.

Similarly, attitudes toward social sanctions—such as exclusion from academic events, revocation of supervisory rights, transparency regarding violations, exclusion from academic forums, ethical referral to professional bodies, and public apology—were also highly supportive. These measures were seen as essential complements to formal disciplinary actions.

Thematic analysis of qualitative data revealed four central themes regarding the implementation and preventive potential of sanctions: (1) **Academic Sanctions as Strong Deterrents.** Participants emphasized that stringent academic sanctions—such as dismissal, demotion, and revocation of academic titles—function as effective deterrents by threatening the professional trajectory and reputation of perpetrators. However, their effectiveness was seen as contingent upon consistent enforcement and a victim-centered, transparent reporting process. (2) **Social Sanctions Reinforce Deterrence.** Social sanctions were described as targeting the perpetrator's social identity and standing within the academic community through stigma, social exclusion, and reputational harm. These measures complement formal sanctions by applying psychological pressure. Their success depends on collective action and a cultural environment that consistently condemns sexual misconduct. (3) **Barriers and Complexities in Enforcement.** Respondents expressed skepticism about the absolute effectiveness of sanctions, noting that some perpetrators—especially those with high institutional status or mental health issues—might evade consequences or continue offending. This highlights challenges related to power asymmetries and institutional protectionism. Strong oversight, secure reporting channels, and survivor protection were deemed essential to overcoming these barriers. (4) **Recommendations for Prevention.** Participants called for transparent, fair, and firm enforcement of sanctions as a clear signal of zero tolerance for sexual violence. Additionally, they recommended integrating ethical education, awareness training, and survivor support services to foster a campus culture that deters sexual violence and encourages reporting.

The convergence of quantitative and qualitative findings illustrates the multifaceted roles of academic and social sanctions. Academic sanctions provide formal accountability mechanisms, while social sanctions operate through community norms

and reputational pressures. Both are essential, yet their effectiveness relies heavily on institutional commitment, transparency, and cultural support.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide robust empirical support for academic and social sanctions as critical deterrents to faculty-perpetrated sexual violence in higher education institutions. The widespread agreement on the application of strict academic sanctions—such as dismissal, suspension, and demotion—reflects public and institutional demand for decisive responses to misconduct, aligning with previous research (Imania & Santoso, 2023; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

Strong endorsement of social sanctions—ranging from exclusion from academic forums to revocation of supervisory rights—further reinforces the view that effective prevention must extend beyond formal disciplinary mechanisms to address the social and cultural dimensions influencing perpetrator behavior (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). These social sanctions impose reputational and relational costs that enhance deterrence by leveraging professional and peer accountability.

Qualitative data offered nuanced insights into the dynamics of sanction implementation. The perceived effectiveness of sanctions was seen to hinge on transparent, consistent enforcement and victim-centered reporting systems. These findings echo longstanding concerns in the literature regarding institutional protectionism and underreporting (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022). Without procedural fairness and sustained institutional commitment, sanctions risk being perceived as symbolic or ineffective (Casey et al., 2021; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

Power asymmetries and structural barriers further complicate the effectiveness of sanctions. Participants expressed skepticism regarding the ability of sanctions to hold high-status perpetrators accountable, particularly when psychological or hierarchical factors allow them to evade consequences. These concerns reflect broader challenges identified in the literature and underscore the need for an integrated approach that combines sanctions with education, cultural transformation, and mental health support (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Milroy et al., 2022).

Emphasis on fair and transparent sanction enforcement aligns with best practices in institutional accountability, which are essential to fostering trust and encouraging reporting (Edwards, Banyard, Rizzo, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

The integration of ethical education and survivor support services acknowledges the multidimensional nature of prevention, encompassing punitive, restorative, and proactive elements (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022).

The dual focus on academic and social sanctions addresses both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators for behavior change. Academic sanctions impose tangible professional penalties, while social sanctions affect intrinsic motivations by influencing identity and social legitimacy (Grimmett et al., 2021; Milroy et al., 2022). This integrated framework supports behavior modification through normative influence and formal deterrence, consistent with social norms theory and behavioral science principles (V. Banyard, Edwards, Mitchell, et al., 2022; Rahmasari et al., 2023).

Finally, the mixed-methods design of this study enhances its analytical rigor by combining the breadth of quantitative data with the depth of qualitative insights. This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of sanction mechanisms and stakeholder perceptions. It offers actionable guidance for policymakers and academic leaders seeking to strengthen prevention and institutional accountability (Rieger et al., 2023; Suardi, 2025; Suardi, Nursalam, et al., 2024).

In conclusion, this study presents compelling evidence that academic and social sanctions—when applied transparently and supported by cultural and educational initiatives—are essential components of an effective prevention framework against faculty-perpetrated sexual violence in higher education institutions.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the role of academic and social sanctions as preventive measures against sexual violence perpetrated by faculty members in higher education institutions. Despite ongoing efforts, sexual violence remains a critical and persistent challenge that threatens student safety and undermines institutional integrity. The study aimed to assess perceptions of sanction effectiveness, enforcement challenges, and stakeholder expectations in order to inform a more comprehensive prevention strategy.

Employing a mixed-methods approach, the study integrated quantitative surveys of students, faculty, and university leaders with qualitative interviews and focus group discussions. The quantitative findings measured levels of agreement with various sanction types, while the qualitative data provided

deeper insight into institutional practices and cultural factors influencing sanction implementation.

The results revealed strong consensus in support of strict academic sanctions—such as dismissal, suspension, and demotion—as well as complementary social sanctions, including exclusion from academic activities and revocation of supervisory privileges. These sanctions were viewed as essential deterrents that influence both formal accountability and social reputation. Qualitative findings emphasized the need for transparent enforcement, victim-centered reporting mechanisms, and strong institutional commitment to addressing power imbalances and underreporting. The study underscores the critical interaction between formal disciplinary measures and informal social regulation in cultivating a campus culture that does not tolerate sexual violence.

This research offers empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of an integrated sanction framework in preventing faculty-perpetrated sexual violence. The findings highlight the importance of combining academic and social sanctions with educational and supportive interventions to achieve sustained prevention. These insights provide valuable guidance for policymakers and academic institutions seeking to strengthen institutional accountability and enhance sexual violence prevention efforts in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Banyard, V., A. Waterman, E., M. Edwards, K., & Valente, T. W. (2022). Adolescent Peers and Prevention: Network Patterns of Sexual Violence Attitudes and Bystander Actions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13–14), NP12398–NP12426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260521997448>
- Banyard, V., Edwards, K. M., Waterman, E. A., Kollar, L. M. M., Jones, L. M., & Mitchell, K. J. (2022). Exposure to a Youth-Led Sexual Violence Prevention Program Among Adolescents: The Impact of Engagement. *Psychology of Violence*, 12(6), 403–412. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000413>
- Banyard, V., Edwards, K., Mitchell, K. J., Greenberg, P., & Jones, L. (2022). Describing youth as actionists for peer sexual violence prevention: correlates of opportunity to act. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 6(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16231534981819>
- Banyard, V. L., Rizzo, A. J., & Edwards, K. M. (2020). Community actionists: Understanding adult bystanders to sexual and domestic violence prevention in communities. *Psychology of Violence*, 10(5), 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000281>
- Casey, E. A., & Hampson, S. C. (2022). Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention Programming on Commuter Campuses: Wisdom From Students and Campus Personnel. *Violence Against Women*, 28(1), 126–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211030946>
- Casey, E. A., Hampson, S. C., & Ackerman, A. R. (2021). Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention and Response: What Drives the Commuter Campus Student Experience? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(21–22), NP11421–NP11445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888188>
- Edwards, K. M., Banyard, V. L., Rizzo, A., & Greenberg, P. (2022). Scope and correlates of high school youths' exposure to dating and sexual violence prevention initiatives. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(1), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22507>
- Edwards, K. M., Banyard, V. L., Waterman, E. A., Hopfauf, S. L., Shin, H.-S., Simon, B., & Valente, T. W. (2022). Use of Social Network Analysis to Identify Popular Opinion Leaders for a Youth-Led Sexual Violence Prevention Initiative. *Violence Against Women*, 28(2), 664–685. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801221994907>
- Edwards, K. M., Siller, L., Eliason, S., Hernandez, N., Jones, J., Richardson, A., & Schmidt, A. J. (2022). The Girls' Leadership Academy: A Promising, Empowerment-Based Approach to the Prevention of Sexual Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 28(5), 1035–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211051402>
- Graham, K., Potterton, H., Mihaere, T., Carrington, B., Treharne, G. J., & Beres, M. A. (2021). Balancing Community Input and Established Research: Findings from the Development of a Sexual Violence Prevention Campaign. *Journal of School Violence*, 20(3), 288–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2021.1897017>
- Graham, K., Treharne, G. J., Liebergreen, N., Stojanov, Z., Shaw, R., & Beres, M. A. (2021).

- A qualitative exploration of barriers to university students' willingness to attend sexual violence prevention workshops. *Sex Education*, 21(2), 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2020.1772225>
- Grimmett, M. A., Conley, A. H., Foster, D., & Clark, C. W. (2021). A Thematic Analysis of the Impact of MY MASCULINITY HELPS as a Tool for Sexual Violence Prevention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5–6), NP3369–NP3387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518772106>
- Imania, K., & Santoso, A. D. (2023). Institutional isomorphism in policies on sexual violence prevention and management in Indonesian universities. *Issues in Educational Research*, 33(2), 673–692. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85163621176&partnerID=40&md5=3ae12495f9ad0b4aefb2d63e5a333873>
- Kaufman, K. L., Lee, D. S., Milroy, J. J., & Raj, A. (2022). Introduction - The Prevention of Sexual Violence in Sport: A Real Game Changer. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13–14), NP10451–NP10458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221095790>
- Kaufman, K. L., Lee, D. S., Milroy, J. J., Yore, J., Sitney, M., Lipman, A., Glace, A., Kyler-Yano, J., & Raj, A. (2022). The Role of Theory in the Prevention of Sexual Violence in Sport. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13–14), NP10459–NP10511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221095787>
- Milroy, J. J., Hanna, K., VandeLinde, T., Lee, D. S., Kaufman, K. L., Raj, A., Barker, K. M., Sitney, M., Lipman, A., Glace, A., & Kyler-Yano, J. (2022). Prevention of Sexual Violence in sport: A Socioecological Review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(13–14), NP10618–NP10641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211067003>
- Nengyanti, Yusnaini, Imania, K., & Santoso, A. D. (2024). Policy Transfer for Sexual Violence Prevention and Management in Indonesian Higher Education Institutions. *Generos*, 13(2), 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.17583/generos.12738>
- Nur, R., & Nur, H. (2024). Equality of Rights and Accessibility Policy Interventions as Prevention of Sexual Violence against Persons with Disabilities: A Mixed Method Study. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(6), 1931–1945. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i6.4149>
- Rahmasari, H., Pradityo, R., Karinda, R., Sitepu, S., & Widyawati, A. (2023). Policies on Prevention and Repression Against Sexual Violence for Higher Education: The Challenges and Expectations. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies*, 8(1), 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v8i1.42736>
- Rieger, A., Blackburn, A. M., Nag, A., Holland, H., & Allen, N. E. (2023). Contradictions in change: Ecological factors in the implementation of outer layer sexual violence prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 72(1–2), 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12672>
- Suardi. (2025). Discussion of Power Relations, Disability Perspectives, Anti-Violence, and Human Rights to Prevent Sexual Violence Against Students. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 16(1), 217–242. <https://www.jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/6125/726>
- Suardi, Hashim, S. Bin, Sadeli, E. H., Nursalam, Nur, R., Nur, H., Mutiara, I. A., & Ramlan, H. (2024). Sexual Violence Prevention and Handling Education Services: Analysis of Student Knowledge in Higher Education. *Indonesian Annual Conference Series*, 1(3), 278–287. <https://www.ojs.literacyinstitute.org/index.php/iacseries/article/view/1517>
- Suardi, Nursalam, Nur, R., & Nur, H. (2023). Preventif Kekerasan Seksual di Perguruan Tinggi. In Tim Kreasi CV. AA. Rizky (Ed.), *Cv. Aa. Rizky* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). CV. AA. RIZKY.
- Suardi, S., Hashim, S. Bin, Nursalam, N., Nur, R., Nur, H., Firdaus, F., & Israpil, I. (2023). Preventing Sexual Violence Against Students Through Structural Policy Interventions of Justice and Gender Equality. *JED (Jurnal Etika Demokrasi)*, 8(4), 581–590. <https://doi.org/10.26618/jed.v8i4.13376>
- Suardi, S., Nursalam, N., Nur, R., & Nur, H. (2024). Equality of Rights and Accessibility Policy Interventions as Prevention of Sexual Violence against Persons with Disabilities : A Mixed Method Study. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(6), 1931 – 1945. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i6.4149>